UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA THE INCLERNAL TO U.S. DISTRICTED TO	JUDGMENT INCLUDING SENTENCE UNDER THE SENTENCING REFORM ACT
x	2 PARK AVENUE, 17th FL.
P.M TIME A.M	NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016  Defendant's Attorney & Address
THE DEFENDANT:  XXX pleaded guilty to count one of the was found guilty on counts	
TITLE & SECTION NATURE & O  21 USC 952(a) & IMPORTATIO  960(b)(3)	FFENSE COUNT NUMBER(S) N OF COCAINE ONE (1)
The sentence is imposed pursuant to the  The defendant has been found not to such count(s).  XXX Remaining counts are dismissed on It is ordered that the defendant has been found not to such count(s).	guilty on count(s) and is discharged as
district within 30 days of any change	t shall notify the United States Attorney for this of residence or mailing address until all fines, ments imposed by this Judgment are fully paid.
Defendant's Soc. Sec #	OCTOBER 6, 2005  Date of Imposition of Sentence
Defendant's Date of Birth 8/29/77	Le-
Defendant's Mailing Address:	ALLYNE K. ROSS, U.S.D.J.
3239 WILSON AVENUE	OCTOBER 6, 2005  Date
BRONX, NEW YORK 10469	A TRUE COPY ATTEST
Defendant's Residence Address:	Date: ROBERT C. HEINEMANN CLERK OF COURT
( SAME AS ABOVE )	By:
The state of the s	

•

DEPUTY CLERK

Defendant:MICHELLE GUMBS Judgment - Page of

Case Number: CR-03-963 (ARR)

## PROBATION

The defendant is hereby placed on probation for a term of three (3) years.

While on probation, the defendant shall not commit another Federal, state, or local crime and shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court (set forth on the following page). If this Judgment imposes a fine or a restitution obligation, it shall be a condition of probation that the defendant pay any such fine or restitution. The defendant shall comply with the following additional conditions:

- 1) DEFT SHALL SERVE SIX (6) MONTHS HOME DETENTION.
- 2) DEFT SHALL MAINTAIN FULL-TIME VERIFIABLE EMPLOYMENT AND/OR SHALL PARTICIPATE IN AN EDUCATION OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM AS DIRECTED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT.
- 3) DEFT SHALL NOT INCUR ANY NEW LINES OF CREDIT WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE COURT OR OF THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT.
- 4) DEFT SHALL PARTICIAPTE IN SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT WITH A TREATMENT PROVIDER SELECTED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT. TREATMENT MAY INCLUDE OUTPATIENT OR RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT AS DETERMINED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT. DEFT SHALL ABSTAIN FROM ALL ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES AND/OR ALCOHOL. DEFT SHALL CONTRIBUTE TO THE COST OF SERVICES RENDERED VIA CO-PAYMENT OR FULL PAYMENT IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT, BASED UPON THE DEFT'S ABILITY TO PAY AND/OR THE AVAILABILITY OF THIRD PARTY PAYMENT.
- 5) DEFT SHALL PARTICIPATE IN A MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT PROGRAM APPROVED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT. DEFT SHALL CONTRIBUTE TO THE COST OF SERVICES RENDERED OR ANY PSYCHOTROPIC MEDICATIONS PRESCRIBED VIA CO-PAYMENT OR FULL PAYMENT IN AN AMOUNT TO BE DETERMINED BY THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT, BASED UPON THE DEFT'S ABILITY TO PAY AND/OR THE AVAILABILITY OF THIRD PARTY PAYMENT.
- 6) DEFT SHALL NOT POSSESS ANY FIREARMS.

Defendant:MICHELLE GUMBS
Case Number:CR-03-963(ARR)

Judgment - Page of

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

While the defendant is on probation or supervised release pursuant to this Judgment:

- 1) The defendant shall not commit another Federal, state or local crime;
- 2) the defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;
- 3) the defendant shall report to the probation officer as directed by the court or probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;
- 4) the defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;
- 5) the defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;
- 6) the defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;
- 7) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of any change in residence or employment;
- 8) the defendant shall refrain from excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any narcotic or other controlled substance, or any paraphernalia related to such substances, except as prescribed by a physician;
- 9) the defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;
- 10) the defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity, and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;
- 11) the defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;
- 12) the defendant shall notify the probation officer within seventy-two hours of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer;
- 13) the defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;
- as directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

These conditions are in addition to any other conditions imposed by this

THE COURT: In this case, the guidelines analysis is not in dispute. The Probation Department and the parties agree that under a correct application of the guidelines, defendant's offense level is 17 and her criminal history category is I. This yields a range of imprisonment of 24 to 30 months.

Defense counsel argues that various recognized grounds for departure under the guidelines, specifically extraordinary family circumstances, diminished capacity, aberrant behavior and post arrest rehabilitation or at least the combination of those grounds in this case, are amply documented by the record to warrant a substantial downward departure from Ms. Gumbs' guidelines, indeed, a departure to a non-incarceratory sentence.

Alternatively, counsel urges that analysis of the pertinent statutory factors enumerated in Section 3552(a) in the particular circumstances of this case warrants a non-guideline sentence with multiple remedial components but one which is also non-incarceratory.

Although the facts of record are not in every respect fully consonant with the demands of all of the stated grounds for departure under the guidelines, I am inclined to agree with counsel that at a minimum, the combination of the stated grounds warrants the relief sought.

In any event, it is clear to me that a statutory

analysis that is a non-guidelines sentence that considers the guidelines as an element or factor fully justifies a sentence akin to that advocated by defense counsel.

Because the record of facts supporting this result is, of course, the same as the facts to be drawn upon in a traditional guideline departure analysis, I believe it's sufficient to proceed with the statutory analysis which will inevitably incorporate much of the material also pertinent to a departure analysis.

At the outset I have considered the guidelines analysis previously discussed. I have also considered the history and characteristics of the defendant.

As fully documented in the presentence report and supplemented by defense counsel's submission, defendant is financial supporter and primary caregiver of her 16-month old daughter Sade. Apparently as a result of her premature delivery, Sade has suffered multiple life-threatening conditions and although recently somewhat improved continues to require intensive care and attention for serious persisting medical problems. These include a serious gastro esophageal reflux condition causing the child to experience violent choking episodes prompting biweekly pediatrician appointments and a number of visits to the emergency room. The condition still requires treatment with several medications and that her head be elevated for 45 minutes after every feeding.

Sade has also experienced severe bronchial problems for which she also remains on medications including multiple nebulizer treatments daily and an inhaled steroid. Sade's pediatrician states that: "Sade is a complicated infant to care for and proper care requires significant time and effort. Her mother is a responsible and dedicated caregiver and her commitment to Sade is evident."

The government observes that since defendant returned to full-time employment approximately five months ago: "Sade has been competently cared for by others during the day." Although this is not contested since defendant acknowledges that she has secured daytime child care, there is no evidence that a competent caregiver is available in the evenings or overnight particularly given Sade's persistent vomiting, choking and respiratory ailments.

The government urges that defendant's family members could provide needed care while defendant is incarcerated. But the presentence report relates that defendant's mother has expressed an inability to do so since she panics when Sade has an emergency. Further, defendant's mother works full time and cares for two other minor children ages 16 and seven.

There is no basis to believe that the family would be in a position to afford independent 24-hour care for Sade were defendant incarcerated.

Based on Sade's life-threatening health problems and

need for constant, competent supervision, coupled with Sade's doctor's report that defendant is a responsible and competent caregiver, the Probation Department has recommended that defendant receive a non-incarceratory sentence. In my experience, such a recommendation by the Probation Department is very unusual if not unprecedented.

The record also establishes severe emotional problems experienced by the defendant herself. The defense has submitted three reports documenting multiple examinations, treatment and testing by three mental health professionals, a psychiatrist, a neuro psychologist and a clinical psychologist. All of the doctors concur that defendant suffers from identified mental impairments that according to Dr. Dorfman give rise to "an extreme if not pathological susceptibility to manipulation by others," explaining how defendant was so "easily manipulated and exploited by others" in connection with her criminal conduct in this case.

All three medical professionals also found defendant profoundly depressed, lonely and isolated and two made reference to the presence of suicidal ideation based in part on such findings. All three doctors expressed the opinion that incarceration would be extremely deleterious to defendant negatively impacting her condition and significantly endangering her both psychologically and physically.

One characterized as "disastrous" the long-run

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

consequences to defendant and her child were defendant to be incarcerated.

Significantly too Dr. Dorfman concluded defendant showed no personality conditions such as anti-social personality disorder predisposing her to future criminal behavior.

Addressing the defendant's requested departure on the grounds of diminished capacity, the government contends that even assuming the existence of a substantial mental impairment, no evidence supports the claim that defendant's condition impaired her ability to control her wrongful conduct. The government does not discuss the conclusions of each of the doctors that defendant's conditions leave her extremely vulnerable, easily influenced and open to manipulation by others whom she trusts.

This inference is made most explicit in Dr.

Dorfman's report that defendant's mental handicaps explain how she was so "easily manipulated and exploited by others in the drug possession case which has led to her current legal problems." But even assuming that this evidence, albeit undisputed by the government, were insufficient to establish the causal nexus required by guideline 5K2.13, it is nonetheless relevant in assessing the characteristics of the defendant.

Also of significance is defendant's strong,

consistent history of gainful employment commencing when she left college in 1999 and interrupted only by a three-month period during the summer of 2004 and a period commencing in December of last year when she stopped working to devote herself full time to the care of her daughter. Notably, for approximately a year between mid 2003 and mid 2004 she worked two jobs simultaneously, one full time and one part time.

Notably too since the birth of her daughter, defendant completed her studies in phlebotomy and is now employed full time earning approximately \$30,000 per year by which she supports herself and her daughter.

It is also worth observing that the progress defendant has made since her arrest in this case in her devotion to the care of her ill infant daughter, her personal progress through psychiatric counseling, her completion of her studies in phlebotomy and her acquisition of full-time employment in that field all evidence very substantial post arrest rehabilitation. Even if this evidence were to fail to meet the high threshold for extraordinary post arrest rehabilitation, it too is nonetheless of significance in assessing statutory factors bearing on defendant's sentence.

Finally, defendant is 26 years old and has not previously been incarcerated. Although apart from traffic offenses, she has had two prior brushes with the law, they do not raise any serious concern regarding her ability or

motivation to lead a law-abiding life.

One of the two arrests occurring five years ago resulted in a conviction for disorderly conduct for which she received a \$75 fine. The other for criminal impersonation did not appear on her NCIC report and no further information regarding it is available.

Turning to the nature and circumstances of the offense of conviction, defendant acted as a courier transporting a quantity of cocaine into the United States from Guyana in a false side of her suitcase. Unlike the typical courier, however, her trip was not made in the expectation of receiving a fixed sum for the payment of her services. Rather, she received only the benefit of the round-trip ticket coupled with some spending money, circumstances which the government does not dispute.

Pertinent too is the psychiatric evidence discussed above supporting the conclusion of medical experts that defendant's specific identifiable mental deficiencies rendered her vulnerable and easily manipulated. Dr. Dorfman specifically cited her vulnerability to the man who involved her in the instant offense. Apparently this individual treated the defendant deceitfully even identifying himself by a fictitious name.

The sentencing statute, 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), directs Courts to impose a sentence "sufficient but not

greater than necessary to comply with" the enumerated purposes of sentencing. Specifically, the sentence should reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law and provide for just punishment.

The offense defendant committed is surely a serious one but the need for incarceration to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment is substantially tempered by the particular facts reviewed above pertaining to defendant's history and characteristics -- specifically, and most importantly, the grave needs of defendant's infant daughter, whose health and life could be jeopardized were she deprived of defendant's care, coupled with defendant's own serious psychological problems and her consistently strong work ethic and recent accomplishment in educating herself for and securing full-time employment in a vocation yielding compensation sufficient to support herself and her ill child.

The sentencing goals of adequate deterrence and protection of the public from further crimes of the defendant are in the circumstances of this case also served by a non-incarceratory sentence. Relevant here as reviewed above are the personal characteristics which render recidivism by this defendant highly unlikely, a conclusion strengthened by expert evidence that defendant manifests no personalty traits predisposing her to future criminal conduct.

The need for general deterrence is also satisfied,

in part based on the particular circumstances of the offense committed, that is, the negligible benefit to defendant from her participation in the crime and her motive for participating which according to the doctors' reports was substantially influenced by her precarious and vulnerable mental state. More importantly, I believe the goal of general deterrence is in this case simply outweighed by the significance of the above cited facts concerning the condition of her daughter militating against an incarceratory sentence.

Further, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities is satisfied by the many respects in which this offender, even if not her offense, is unusual.

Finally, as emphasized by the experts, the need to provide defendant with training, care and other treatment in the most effective manner are best served by doing so in a non-incarceratory sentence.

I, therefore, will follow the recommendation of the United States Probation Department and sentence the defendant to three years probation with the following special conditions: The defendant shall serve six months home detention, that will not interfere with her work because that can be worked out with the Probation Department. The defendant shall maintain full-time verifiable employment and will participate in educational or vocational training as directed by the Probation Department. She shall not incur any

new lines of credit without the permission of the Probation Department.

The defendant shall participate in substance abuse treatment with a treatment provider selected by the Probation Department, treatment may include outpatient or residential treatment. The defendant shall abstain from all illegal substances and/or alcohol and contribute to the cost of services rendered by a co-payment or full payment in an amount to be determined by the Probation Department based on defendant's ability to pay and/or the availability of third-party payment.

The defendant shall participate in a mental health treatment program with a treatment provider selected by the Probation Department and contribute to the cost of services rendered or any psychotropic medications prescribed via co-payment or full payment in an amount to be determined by the Probation Department based on her ability to pay and/or the availability of third-party payment.

Obviously, I prohibit the possession of a firearm.

I make a finding that she is unable to pay a fine but I will impose the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

As I recall, there are no open counts, is that right? Count Two remains open.

MS. JONES: The government moves to dismiss the remaining counts.

THE COURT:

RT: The motion is granted.

J

Ms. Gumbs, there are circumstances in which a defendant may appeal a sentence; I don't believe it applies in your case. You discuss that with your lawyer and if you choose to appeal, a notice of appeal must be filed within ten

days and undoubtedly, she would continue to represent you.

MS. CARDI: Thank you.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

(The matter was concluded.)